Info-Hams Digest   Wed, 13 Oct 93   Volume 93 : Issue 1219

Today's Topics:
                              ATV on 439.25

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 1993 21:19:38 +0000
From: news.sprintlink.net!demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!dave@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ATV on 439.25
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CEsKsw.5G0@cbnewsj.cb.att.com> ker@mtgzfs3.att.com (131P2[sfm]-
k.e.roser(MT4084)1047MT) writes:
>
>1) What does ATV audio normally sound like if detected on a narrowband FM
>transceiver?
>
ATV audio is wideband FM - you will probably get something intelligible on
a NBFM system but it will be distorted.

>2) Is the buzzing a result of what he uses for modulation. I believe his
>goal is to get as much RF energy on our repeater input frequency as possible.
>For all I know he's modulating the audio with a 60Hz square wave.
>
The buzzing is due to the sidebands of the ATV signal, which is quite complex.
You basically have spectral lines separated by the line frequency, with other
lines round them separated by the frame frequency (which is 60Hz, assuming a
standard US NTSC type system).

>3) What's the bandwidth of a typical ATV audio signal. (I wasn't satisfied
>with the info in the ARRL Handbook)
>
The audio subcarrier should be right at the top of the official passband, about
5.5MHz above the vision carrier I think (6MHz for UK PAL)

>4) Is it possible for ATV operation on 439.25 to coexist with a high
>density of repeaters on 440. This is in the New York/New Jersey metropolitan
>area.
>
You will probably find that if he were to tweak the xtal in his transmitter
slightly the problem would go away, at least on your channel. You are
unfortunate enough that one of the line-frequency spectral lines is within your
passband - by careful tweaking he ought to be able to get two lines to straddle
your input frequency and so be outside your passband on either side. Of course,
he may well have tweaked up the xtal to achieve the opposite effect.

Dave
--

Date: 13 Oct 1993 05:39:48 GMT
From: agate!soda.berkeley.edu!lee@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2544@indep1.uucp>, <29dksn$2s2@agate.berkeley.edu>,
<29efm5$lnp@inxs.concert.net>
Subject : Re: Imminent Death of Ham Radio: 2m HT in Penney's Christmas Catalog

In article <29efm5$lnp@inxs.concert.net>,
Derrick Cole <cole@concert.net> wrote:

>I always thought it was "break, break" (theory books), but I assume local
>colloquialisms reign supreme.

Actually, it's "Break, break, break" according to my books, but
"Break" is generally used for "important", rather than "Hey, I'd
like to get in on this ragchew."

[...]

>What irritates me is that the one or two times I've said "break, break" (in
>the guise of calling 911) in my ham-life on a repeater, I have to then ask to
>use the patch, get an acknowledgment, etc, etc. If/When I say "break, break",
>shut up and let me call 911. If not, then what's stopping me from saying
>"salad, salad" (other than being ignored as a cabbage-head)?

I think that may just depend on your repeater group. If it's a loaded up
machine, you may need to ask to use the phone patch. If the repeater
trustees have already given you the codes to the phone patch, then they
should probably trust you enough to assume you wouldn't be using it
without _some_ good reason, if the machine were loaded. Maybe the
people running repeaters out here are just more lax about things.
They *would* like it if you gave your callsign before sending the patch
codes, though. ;)

--
>>>>____ >>>>>>>>>>>>>>All Standard Disclaimers Apply>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
 ___\ /   Lee M. Thompson-Herbert lee@soda.berkeley.edu   >>>>>
 \ /\/   KD6WUR   >>>>
  \/Semper Bi   This is a job for CAPTAIN NAPALM!   >>>>

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1219
****